

***Remarks***

Applicants and their representatives thank the Examiner for the Examiner Interview conducted on October 4, 2006.

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-16, 18, 19, and 21 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 13-16 and 21 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 6, 9, 10, 13-16, 18, 19, and 21 are sought to be amended. Claims 5, 17, and 20 are sought canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claim 12 was previously canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections.

***Objections to the Claims and Allowable Subject Matter***

In paragraph 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 5-10 and 20 were objected to as being dependent on rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claims and any intervening claims.

Claims 5-10 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to recite the features of claim 5. Claim 5 has been canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. The objection to claim 5 is thus rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection of claim 5 are requested.

Claims 6, 9, and 10 have been amended to depend from claim 1 rather than claim 5. Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 6. Claims 6-10 are thus in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection of claims 6-10 are requested.

Claim 20 depends from independent claim 16, through intervening claim 17. Claim 16 has been amended to recite the features of claims 17 and 20. Claims 17 and 20

have been canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. The objection to claim 20 is thus rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection of claim 20 are requested.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Dabell (U.S. Patent 6,621,862). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner cites the signal oscillator in FIG. 2 of Dabell as "generating a clock signal for each of the multi-gigabit analog information signals from each of the respective multi-gigabit analog information signals," as recited in claim 15.

As discussed in the Examiner Interview, Applicants contend that there is no indication in Dabell that the oscillator in FIG. 2 generates a clock signal for each of a plurality of signals "from each of the respective" signals.

Nevertheless, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, and not in acquiescence to the Examiner's characterization of Dabell, claim 15 has been amended to further recite:

wherein said equalizing process comprises the steps of minimizing differences between post-transition sample amplitudes and steady state sample amplitudes of the samples.

These features are taken from claim 5, and are not taught or suggested by Dabell as indicated by the Examiner in paragraph 9 of the Office Action, where claim 5 is determined to be allowable.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 are requested.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

In paragraphs 5-7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 11, 13, 14 and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Dabell (U.S. Patent 6,621,862), alone and/or in view of Mazor (U.S. Patent 5,235,671). Applicants respectfully traverse.

As discussed above, claim 1 has been amended to recite the features of allowable dependant claim 5. As such, claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 are requested.

Claims 2-4 and 11 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and are thus patentable for at least the reasons provided above with respect to claim 1, in addition to the features recited therein. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-4 and 11 are requested.

Independent claims 13 and 14 have been amended to recite the features of allowable claim 5. As such, claims 13 and 14 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13 and 14 are requested.

Claim 16 has been amended to recite the features of claim 20 (including the features of intervening claim 17), which the Examiner has indicated would be allowable if so rewritten. As such, claim 16 is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 are requested.

Claim 17 has been canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. The rejection of claim 17 is thus rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 are requested.

Claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 16 and are thus patentable for at least the reasons provided above with respect to claim 16, in addition to the features recited therein. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18 and 19 are requested.

In paragraph 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Shimomura *et al.*, (U.S. Patent 6,404,525). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 21 has been amended to recite the features of allowable claim 5, which are not taught or suggested by Shimomura. As such, claim 21 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 are requested.

### ***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding objections and rejections.

Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

  
Patrick E. Garrett  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 39,987

Date: 10/18/06

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

525927\_3.DOC

Atty. Dkt. No. 1875.0560003